This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,850	08/15/2001	Ivan Wong	SUNMP010	2120

25920 7590 08/23/2004

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 170
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER	
CAO, DIEM K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,850	WONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K Cao	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-7 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 16 recite the limitation "removing master/slave functionality" which make the claims indefinite because in the process of creating a framework, removing a function does not make sense if the framework is created from scratch unless the new framework is creating based upon an existing framework.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 6-9, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (Java media framework API Guide) in view of Keeley (U.S. 6,138,271).

6. **As to claim 1**, Sun teaches a multimedia framework application programming interface supports a synchronous programming model (Player, stop method; pages 11-12), and a pull data delivery protocol (Pull Data-Source ... HTTP and FILE; page 5).

7. However, Sun does not teach a multimedia framework API capable of operation in mobile hardware device, and removing master/slave functionality. Keeley teaches reducing the size of the operating system for use with an embedded computer that has limited memory resource by removing functionalities that are not needed by the applications in the embedded computer (the ability to reduce the size ... an embedded computer; col. 3, lines 37-39 and col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 3).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept teaching by Keeley to the system of Sun because it would provides a method to have the media framework for the mobile devices that have limited memory.

9. **As to claim 6**, Sun teaches the operation of providing specialized players (Java Media Framework ... RMF and WAV; page 2 and Players; pages 11-12 and page 22.

10. **As to claim 7**, Sun teaches the specialized players include an MPEG player (MPEG; page 2 and Players; pages 11-12, 22).

11. **As to claim 8**, Sun teaches a codec (codec; page 17), a data source in communication with the codec (Data Source; page 11), a media engine (A player, a processor; pages 11-12 and pages 16-17) having a plurality of components in communication with the codec and the data source (Demultiplexer, Effect, Codec, Multiplexer, Renderer; page 17), wherein each component is accessible utilizing a synchronous programming model (Player, stop method; pages 11-12), and wherein each component utilizes a pull data delivery protocol (Pull Data-Source ... HTTP and FILE; page 5).

12. However, Sun does not teach a multimedia framework API capable of operation in mobile hardware device. Keeley teaches reducing the size of the operating system for use with an embedded computer that has limited memory resource by removing functionalities that are not needed by the applications in the embedded computer (the ability to reduce the size ... an embedded computer; col. 3, lines 37-39 and col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 3).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept teaching by Keeley to the system of Sun because it would provides a method to have the media framework for the mobile devices that have limited memory.

14. **As to claim 9**, Sun does not teach each component is set to exclude master/slave functionality. Keeley teaches reducing the size of the operating system for use with an embedded

computer that has limited memory resource by removing functionalities that are not needed by the applications in the embedded computer (the ability to reduce the size ... an embedded computer; col. 3, lines 37-39 and col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 3).

15. **As to claim 14**, see rejection of claim 6 above.

16. **As to claim 15**, see rejection of claim 7 above.

17. Claims 2, 10, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (Java media framework API Guide) in view of Keeley (U.S. 6,138,271) further in view of Ronkka et al. (U.S. 2004/0088710 A1).

18. **As to claim 2**, Sun and Keeley do not teach a memory size of the mobile multimedia framework API is less than 100 kilobytes. Ronkka teaches the size of the operating system for embedded system is usually between 10 and 100 kB (section 0002). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sun, Keeley and Ronkka because limiting size of the software to a smaller one would server better for the mobile devices since they have limited memory size.

19. **As to claim 10**, see rejection of claim 2 above.

20. **As to claim 16**, see rejections of claims 1, 2 and 6 above.

21. **As to claim 20**, see rejection of claim 7 above.

22. Claims 3-5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (Java media framework API Guide) in view of Keeley (U.S. 6,138,271) further in view of Travostino (Real-Time Local and Remote MACH IPC: Architecture and Design).

23. **As to claim 3**, Sun teaches a push data delivery protocol is utilized in the media framework (Push Data-Source; page 5). However, Sun and Keeley do not teach a push data delivery protocol is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sun, Keeley and Travostino because it teaches to remove the non-critical features from the framework and put in the application layer to produce a smaller size of the framework that could be used with the mobile devices.

24. **As to claim 4**, Sun teaches an asynchronous programming model is utilized in the media framework (When your program calls an asynchronous method on a Player; pages 11-12). However, Sun and Keeley do not teach an asynchronous programming model is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16).

25. **As to claim 5**, Sun and Keeley do not explicitly teach master/slave functionality is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16).

26. **As to claim 11**, see rejection of claim 3 above.

27. **As to claim 12**, see rejection of claim 4 above.

28. **As to claim 13**, see rejection of claim 5 above.

29. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (Java media framework API Guide) in view of Keeley (U.S. 6,138,271) and Ronkka et al. (U.S. 2004/0088710 A1) further in view of Travostino (Real-Time Local and Remote MACH IPC: Architecture and Design).

30. **As to claim 17**, Sun teaches a push data delivery protocol is utilized in the media framework (Push Data-Source; page 5). However, Sun, Keeley and Ronkka do not teach a push data delivery protocol is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sun, Keeley, Ronkka and Travostino because it teaches to remove the non-critical features from the framework and put in the application layer and keep

critical/important features to produce a smaller size of the framework that could be used with the mobile devices.

31. **As to claim 18**, Sun teaches an asynchronous programming model is utilized in the media framework (When your program calls an asynchronous method on a Player; pages 11-12). However, Sun Keeley and Ronkka do not teach an asynchronous programming model is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16).

32. **As to claim 19**, Sun Keeley and Ronkka do not explicitly teach master/slave functionality is only utilized in an application layer. Travostino teaches the x-kernel framework can be built in both user space and kernel space without differences (pages 14-16).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220 or (571) 272-3760 (after November 1st 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678 or (571) 272-3756 (after November 1st 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Diem Cao

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100